

TOWN OF ARLINGTON
BUILDING MAINTENANCE COMMITTEE
March 17, 2014– Minutes

Members Present:

Ruthy Bennett
Vincent Cerbone
Christine Deshler
Diane Johnson
Mark Miano
Barbara Thornton

Guests: Michael Bouton

Business:

1. The Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.
2. The next meeting of the committee was scheduled for Monday, March 31, 2014 at 4:00 pm.
3. A draft of the “Arlington Maintenance Policy – 3/10/14” prepared by B. Thornton was circulated and discussed. Members’ comments included the following:
 - Delete references to a 1-3% annual maintenance expenditure as it is too early to project a budget figure. That range (1-3%), however, does seem to be commonly used by other communities who budget for maintenance. R. Bennett offered to see what amount Bedford allocates.
 - References to Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) were substituted for SchoolDude as there are other vendors that can potentially satisfy the town’s requirements.
 - There was a discussion about the need to draft a policy that clearly outlines the proper hierarchy and the interrelationship between a facilities division head, department heads and a building maintenance committee. Also, there was a discussion as to who can make service requests (and the need for everyone to be trained on how to make them) and the need for there to be a decision making protocol. How will the policy insure that staff gets attention, who is accountable?
 - There was a discussion concerning the distinction between long term, mid-term, short term and emergency maintenance requests. Long term requests are those that are short of a capital item; mid-term are recurring and predictable maintenance needs (i.e., routine annual work); short term are unanticipated and unpredictable service requests; and emergencies are urgent, unanticipated needs.
 - The building maintenance policy should be distinct from a report to Town Meeting which should be condensed, kept succinct and understandable, and not filled with details that can be picked apart.

- Until a software system is up and running, it will be difficult to know whether and how it can be used to, i.e., forecast budgets or trigger updates. Some decisions will have to wait until after system is chosen.
 - How will progress be measured? By lower costs? Lower manpower deployment? Fewer events or surprises? Better cared for assets?
 - It will be both difficult to budget for emergency maintenance and not desirable to allow department heads to do so. Department heads should not be allowed to have an emergency contingency because it will be spent. Instead they need to be incentivized to not have emergencies.
 - The policy should address how progress is monitored and by whom. There was a discussion about how much information should be tracked by a software system so that progress can be measured or so that problems can be discovered promptly. Also a discussion as to who reviews the information and who should, and should not, have access to it.
4. B. Thornton will update the draft for the next meeting of the committee. She also volunteered to prepare a draft bullet-point report for Town Meeting.

Submitted by Christine Deshler, Secretary.